

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/827,022	04/19/2004		B. Raghava Reddy	HES 2003-IP-012018U1	2519	
28857	7590	08/07/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
CRAIG W.		=	COY, NI	COY, NICOLE A		
P.O. BOX 14		ERGY SERVICES	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
DUNCAN,	DUNCAN, OK 73536-0440				3672	
				DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/827,022	REDDY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Nicole Coy	3672				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ju	<u>ıly 2006</u> .					
	,—					
, 	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/19/04,2/3/05. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-16 in the reply filed on 7/11/06 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there would be no additional burden on the Examiner to search and examine all claims. This is not found persuasive because composition claims 17-35 can be used as a thickener in a painting or coating formulation, thus the inventions are distinct. As the inventions are distinct they require different classification. Thus, there would be an additional burden on the Examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9-11, 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Griffith et al. (USP 6,448,206).

With respect to claim 1, Griffith et al. discloses a method of servicing a wellbore in contact with a subterranean formation, comprising: displacing a sealant composition comprising a colloidally stabilized latex into the wellbore (see column 4 lines 25-39).

With respect to claim 2, Griffith et al. discloses that the colloidally stabilized latex comprises: an aliphatic conjugated diene monomer (see column 6 line 48 to column 7

line 2); an additional monomer comprising a non-aromatic unsaturated mono- or dicarboxylic ester monomer, an aromatic unsaturated monomer, a nitrogen-containing monomer, or combinations thereof (see column 6 line 48 to column 7 line 2); and a protective colloid (see column 2 line 65, wherein the surfactant is a protective colloid).

With respect to claim 4, Griffith et al. teaches that the colloidally stabilized latex comprises a surfactant having ethylenic unsaturation to allow the surfactant to copolymerize with the aliphatic conjugated diene monomer and the additional monomer, thereby forming a polymer having the surfactant in its backbone (see column 7 line 53 to column 8 line 59).

With respect to claim 6, Griffith et al. discloses that the colloidally stabilized latex comprises a functionalized silane generally represented by the formula as claimed by applicant (see column 9 line 7-20).

With respect to claim 9, Griffith et al. discloses that the sealant composition comprises salt (see column 8 lines 33-34).

With respect to claim 10, Griffith et al. discloses that the sealant composition comprises fibers, beads, or combinations thereof (wherein the polymer would be in the form fibers or beads).

With respect to claim 11, Griffith et al. discloses that the sealant composition comprises a cement slurry (see column 9 lines 21-45).

With respect to claim 13, Griffith et al. discloses the sealant composition is positioned in the wellbore to isolate the subterranean formation from a portion of the wellbore, to support a conduit in the wellbore, to plug a void or crack in the conduit, to

plug a void or crack in a cement sheath disposed in an annulus of the wellbore, to plug an opening between the cement sheath and the conduit, or combinations thereof (see the abstract).

With respect to claim 14, Griffith et al. discloses that the colloidally stabilized latex comprises a vulcanizable group, a vulcanizing agent, a vulcanization accelerator, a vulcanization retarder, or combinations thereof (see column 9 lines 21-45).

With respect to claim 15, Griffith et al. discloses that the colloidally stabilized latex comprises a crosslinkable monomer, an acidic catalyst, a thermosetting resin, or combinations thereof (see column 9 lines 21-45, wherein the polymer can be crosslinked).

With respect to claim 16, Griffith et al. discloses a drilling fluid with the sealant composition near a loss-circulation zone, thereby forming a solid mass in the loss-circulation zone (see column 2 line 64 to column 3 line 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3, 5, 7, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grittith et al. in view of Krishanan et al. (USP 5,900,251).

With respect to claim 3, Griffith et al. does not teach that the protective colloid comprises polyvinylalcohol, a cellulose ether, a natural gum, a synthetic gum, polyacrylic acid, an acrylate, a poly(vinyl alcohol)co(vinyl amine) copolymer, or combinations thereof. Krishnan et al. teaches adding protective colloids, such as polyvinylalcohol, a cellulose ether, a natural gum, a synthetic gum, polyacrylic acid, an acrylate, a poly(vinyl alcohol)co(vinyl amine) copolymer, to a latex because of the rheology and tack properties. It would have been obvious to modify Grittith et al. by adding a protective colloid as noted above, because of the rheology and tack properties of systems with said protective colloids.

With respect to claim 5, Griffith et al. does not disclose that the colloidally stabilized latex comprises an oxyalkylene functional monomer. Krishnan et al. discloses an oxyalkylene monomer in order to add stability to the polymer. It would have been obvious to modify Griffith et al. by including a oxyalkylene monomer as taught by Krishnan et al. in order to add stability to the polymer.

With respect to claim 7, Griffith et al. is silent as to whether the colloidally stabilized latex remains substantially stable in the presence of salt. However, due to the added protective colloids of Krishnan, the stabilized latex would remain stable in the presence of salt, as latex of Griffith et al. in view of Krishnan is substantially similar to the latex claimed.

With respect to claim 8, monovalent ion, a divalent ion, or combinations thereof are well known salts found in wellbores.

With respect to claim 12, Griffith et al. in view of Krishnan et al. discloses that the sealant composition is displaced into an annulus of the wellbore and allowed to set.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicole Coy whose telephone number is 571-272-5405. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00, 1st F off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

nac

William Neuder Primary Examiner